# BRE Global's response to the Home Quality Mark's summer 2015 consultation feedback

## 1. Introduction

This report summarises the feedback received on the Home Quality Mark (HQM)'s consultation technical guidance and scoring approach, which was released for public consultation between the 20th of July and the 4th of September. The consultation was part of a wider process of creating the HQM standard over the last 18 months which involved:

### Market Research

Three studies were commissioned to investigate:

- What factors influence people's choice of home
- What people think about living in a 'sustainable' home and
- How renters and buyers would react to having a quality rating tool for homes.

### Technical Research

This involved:

- Liaising with experts across the industry who provided feedback to help form the technical background and structure of HQM. Information was gathered through a series of workshops and numerous one to one meetings with assessors, developers, designers and other industry experts.
- A number of projects have and are participating as study sites, to test the HQM standard in practice.
- Industry wide technical development such as on Overheating, with support from BRE ltd.
- Strategic research and development activities across the BREEAM team, contributed to by external consultation including:
    o The Strategic Ecology Framework
    o New Methodology for Generating BREEAM Scheme Category Weightings
    o HQM and BREEAM: a new approach to assessing VOCs and formaldehyde in indoor air
    o Strategic approach to the selection and procurement of construction materials and products

This technical research has contributed to HQM and continues to feed into the scheme's ongoing development.

### First HQM assessed homes

The Wienerberger E4 Brick house and ZED Factory's Zero Bills homes are to be some of the first to be officially assessed against the HQM beta version. These case studies are both located on BRE Watford's Innovation Park and are being used to further test HQM alongside various study sites (see here for examples).

## BRE Global Governing Body and Standing Panel review

As a certification body, BRE Global are subject to review by an independent Governing Body and Standing panel, in order to safeguard impartiality for all of their certification schemes. The Governing Body members give guidance and advice through their wide knowledge and experience. The review will occur prior to the release of version 1 of HQM, which will follow the beta version.

## Events

The HQM team have presented the scheme at over 60 events and meetings as well as at key industry conferences attended by: government, local authorities, large and small developers, product manufactures, financial sector, health experts, community groups, consumer groups, representative industry organisations, professional bodies and housing groups. These presentations have raised awareness, opened up meaningful discussions and generated invaluable feedback directly from key stakeholders which has made a major contribution to the development of HQM.

## Media coverage

HQM has been discussed and promoted via: national press, national television, national radio, online articles and industry publications. As a voluntary, consumer focussed standard, effective circulation of the HQM brand has been an important part of raising awareness and engaging with industry. See the HQM website for more information: www.homequalitymark.com/media.

## Consultation overview

The purpose of the consultation was to provide stakeholders with an opportunity to engage with the technical development of HQM and to ensure that it is relevant for new homes now and in the future.

This consultation involved collecting feedback via an in-depth online questionnaire (supported by Typeform) composed of 56 questions with a mixture of open and closed questions that focused on:

- The value of particular technical issues
- Technical criteria
- Overall structure, scoring system, credit structure, scope of scheme
- General comments


Questions were chosen to collect feedback on the key principles of the HQM standard as well as the scheme's proposed technical direction.

Overall we received many positive and constructive responses, which have been very helpful in refining HQM to make it more suitable for industry needs and to provide a mechanism for recognising and encouraging quality in sustainable homes.

We received an excellent level of feedback with 81 in-depth responses to the online questionnaire.  Many of these were from representative organisations who held their own discussions with their members and affiliates.  The vast majority of the top level organisations were represented. Overall the response rate represents around 80% of stakeholders across the new build housing sector, with a large proportion of key industry

stakeholders and a wide variety of individual experts including: sustainability consultants, architects, engineers, local authorities, product manufacturers, contractors, developers, housing specialists, planning officers, surveyors and professional bodies.

BRE Global would like to take this opportunity to thank everyone who has contributed so far.

Several respondents reported problems with submitting the online questionnaire near the time of the consultation deadline. Please accept our apologies if you were affected by this. All feedback that was received via e-mail as a result of these problems was acknowledged and has fed into the consultation process alongside the online questionnaire responses. Thank you for making the effort to get these responses to us. The technical problems were investigated by our IT team at the time, who reported that the issues were on Typeform's side, which we had no control over. These difficulties have been noted and will be considered when setting up future consultations.

This report provides a summary of the feedback received and acts as a bridge between the summer consultation and the beta version of the HQM manual. The beta version of the manual was released in December 2015 and HQM was opened for registrations in January 2016. The following section summarises each of the key themes that emerged from the feedback and BRE Global's response to this feedback. Tables 1 to 3 give further detail and supporting information, as follows:

- Table 1: Further detail on key themes (where marked with an * in the next section)
- Table 2: Full list of removed, merged and fundamentally changed issues following consultation
- Table 3: Full list of issue name changes from consultation to beta version.

## 2. Key themes

Overall consultation feedback was strongly supportive of the principals underpinning HQM in terms of its aim to recognise and drive quality and sustainable homes using a holistic approach; including its emphasis on the people living in the homes. General comments supported HQM as a way of maintaining the momentum from the Code for Sustainable Homes (CSH), following Government's decision to wind this down as part of the drive for deregulation in the housebuilding sector. Some comments also offered specific technical suggestions that helped to refine the scheme for the beta version of HQM. Some clear themes have emerged from the consultation feedback, which are outlined and discussed in the following section.

### Structure

For the most part, feedback suggested that the proposed HQM structure needed to be clearer; the structure outlined in the consultation scored a low average of 4.6 out of 10. In contrast replies also suggested that respondents liked particular elements of the structure, such as the three sections the issues fit into, 'Our surroundings', 'My home' and 'Knowledge sharing', e.g:

> "In general we like the split into home, surroundings and knowledge sharing. It's logical and should improve the functionality of the scheme…"

Although feedback was mixed, some clear messages emerged in relation to aspects of HQM's structure. The below addresses this feedback and outlines some of the key changes to HQM's structure for the beta version as a result.

*Credit structure*

**Feedback**

There were mixed responses in terms of how credits were structured within the consultation document. For example, when asked if respondents agreed whether the scoring should be out of 500 credits, with each credit having equal value across the whole scheme, 42% neither agreed nor disagreed, 40% agreed and 18% disagreed. This mixed response may be linked with recurring comments that were made, relating to the number of credits that should be available for specific issues across HQM (see the Scope section below).

**Response**

The reason for making credits equal across HQM is to simplify the assessment process and make options clearer for clients, where a specific rating is being pursued. For instance if a client is aiming for a particular rating, they can clearly weigh up their options of how much each credit contributes. This will make it easier to decide what additional credits to pursue if the project falls short after the initial assessment. Removing the need to consider 'hidden' credit weightings was a clear message from assessor workshops held in autumn, 2014, in order to make credit routes clearer for clients and assessors in this sector.

*Rigour routes\**

**Feedback**

There were mixed comments regarding the "routes of rigour" feature within some of the proposed HQM technical issues. Where present, the routes of rigour recognise different ways to comply with criteria including a mixture of: foundation, intermediate and comprehensive routes. This is designed to recognise high levels of assessment rigour with the award of credits. Although some comments suggested they liked the flexibility that came with alternative routes, some found it confusing to determine how many credits were available for certain issues. Others also suggested that some of the foundation routes were too easy to achieve.

There was also some confusion about whether the same route of rigour would need to be followed across all issues for the whole assessment, or if different levels of rigour can be used to achieve credits within different issues.

**Response**

Work has been carried out to ensure that rigour routes are communicated consistently to make the structure clearer and easier to understand. Please also see table 1 for more information.

## Core criteria

**Feedback**

Some respondents were unsure how the 'core issue' structure worked (i.e. placing home information and monitoring and controls throughout a number of relevant issues, rather than being two separate issues). This made it difficult to track how many credits there are and where exactly they are awarded.

**Response**

The core criteria credit structure has been dropped, in order to simplify the layout and make it easier to communicate the credits available. Where issues are linked, this is clearly indicated where appropriate.

## Star rating*

**Feedback**

Some respondents were uncertain about how difficult it will be to achieve certain star ratings, suggesting that greater transparency is needed.

**Response**

HQM is being developed with the intention that a five star rating is achievable but represents the top standard of housing at the time of certification and drives best practice forward. For more details on how this will work, please see table 1.

## Certification stages

**Feedback**

Questions were raised about how certification will work for HQM and if there will be a design stage and a post-construction stage certification, similar to CSH.

**Response**

As with BREEAM, HQM has a design stage (DS) and post construction stage (PCS) assessment process. Certificates for both stages will confirm the star rating awarded but the PCS certificate will have much more detail than the DS certificate. The PCS will look similar to the scorecard example on the HQM website.

## Scope

There were a range of views regarding HQM's technical scope with some prioritising particular issues and others suggesting certain issues should be removed or significantly changed. Given the wide array of stakeholders replying and HQM's holistic perspective, this is perhaps unsurprising. Despite this several recurring themes have been identified, in terms of the number and types of issues, which have helped to streamline the scheme. Some recurring comments relating to technical issues covered by building regulations/planning requirements and independent schemes are also summarised.

### *Number of issues*

**Feedback**

Responses frequently suggested that greater focus was need on priority areas in order to get the most benefit from using HQM. Comments suggested there were too many technical issues, and that the allocation of credits should be reviewed to provide more credits in specific issues. These comments reiterate what has been outlined in the structure section (see above). In essence, the message received was that HQM would be more effective if its scope was more focused.

Respondents scored HQM's 'appropriateness of credit allocation throughout HQM' with an average of 5.58 out of 10. This reinforced views that suggested some issues should be removed in order to be able to award more credits within priority areas. A number of specific comments highlighted the fact that a few key issues were already mostly covered by planning requirements or seemed to be beyond HQM's scope.

**Response**

Following careful consideration, several issues have been removed or merged to streamline HQM and help to make it more accessible. Credit allocations have also been reviewed in line with BREEAM weightings, and tailored to better fit the needs of the homes sector. For a full list of removed and merged issues, and additional explanations, please see table 2.

*Post-certification commitments\**

**Feedback**

The knowledge sharing section of HQM contains criteria that award credits for processes or commitments that need to happen *after* HQM certification, i.e. once homes are in-use. Examples include Aftercare Support, Post Occupancy Evaluation (POE) and Home Information. There was general support for this approach and agreement that it is important for ensuring homes perform as designed. However several respondents raised concern that it would be difficult to monitor and assess whether these commitments are actually carried out in practice. Typical responses were:

> *"I think this [aftercare] is a very important issue, as it both increases the user's ability to enjoy their house, and the experience of buying a new home."*
>
> *"In theory, a nice idea. In practice, probably very difficult. If you're comparing this with BREEAM, a residential unit is essentially like a 'mini company' so committing to something like this could be costly."*
>
> *"It's [POE] very difficult to control"*
>
> *"Not sure how this [aftercare] will be incorporated (or monitored)"*

**Response**

Extending HQM's scope to the in-use stage is an important part of delivering quality homes in practice and reducing the performance gap. Ensuring commitments are carried out is clearly a key challenge. Criteria have been added to the knowledge sharing section to recognise developers who provide robust warranties and post occupancy support. Recognition is also given where effort is made to raise the level of customer understanding regarding what they should expect from their new home and how to manage it effectively. BRE Global are also exploring various ways to engage with occupants directly, to help them get the most out of their home. For more information on how this is being addressed, see "Post-certification commitments" in Table 1 for details.

*Building Regulations and planning requirements\**

**Feedback**

A small number of respondents questioned the justification for HQM's overall scope and the inclusion of specific issues. They argued that many of the issues are already more or less covered by building regulations.

**Response**

This comment was taken on board and various issues have been removed or redeveloped, in order to streamline the scheme and ensure that they go beyond the requirements set out by regulation to provide additional benefit and value to the home occupier/owner. As a result, certain priority issues partly covered by planning or building regulations are still included in order to encourage and recognise best practice. This is considered an essential step to try and reduce the performance gap. For further detail on HQM's position in relation to regulations/planning, please see table 1.

*Other certification schemes*

**Feedback**

A number of queries were raised about how other independent certification schemes or standards like Passivhaus or relevant BREEAM schemes will fit into the HQM process.

**Response**

As a part of the on-going work to develop a final version of HQM, we are reviewing relevant schemes with a view to establishing a set of 'deemed to satisfy' routes for achieving certain aspects of HQM, based on other independent schemes or standards used alongside HQM. This approach will therefore acknowledge existing processes and best practice and avoid duplication of evaluation and/or information. More details on this will be released in the near future.

## Technical content

### *Depth and complexity**

**Feedback**

On the whole respondents were positive about the range of technical issues covered but there were suggestions to simplify certain aspects of HQM and introduce more flexibility into some technical criteria, especially as HQM is a voluntary scheme.

Various respondents expressed concern that some of the criteria may be too ambitious for some developments. For example, it was noted that rural developments may find it difficult to achieve the credits around regular public transport links as part of the 'accessible public transport' issue, compared to urban dwellings.

Particular concern was voiced regarding small developments/developers and whether they would be able to meet a number of requirements within certain issues. For example, this comment was made in relation the requirements in the Aftercare issue:

> *"The ability of smaller developers and projects to meet the requirements of this issue [aftercare] requires further careful consideration. There is a risk that the requirements are too onerous."*

Comments suggested that this was because small developers are less likely to have the resources, internal expertise or experience to achieve credits for: fabric testing, aftercare support and others.

**Response**

Although we agree with some of the concerns raised our experience of working with various developers has shown that smaller companies often do have the time and flexibility to produce high quality homes and are also able to offer tailored aftercare support to occupants. We have made every effort to address this in the revision and have simplified technical issues across HQM as much as possible; see Table 1 for more details. We recognise that ensuring HQM is easy to understand with clear requirements is essential for encouraging uptake of the scheme at all levels in the sector.

### *Tools**

**Feedback**

Several respondents mentioned that they were unable to comment on certain aspects of HQM's technical content, as information was missing and none of the energy and material tools were available for assessment.

**Response**

We appreciate that some feedback could not be given as the tools were unavailable at the time of consultation. These will be available during the beta stage for live use and feedback will be monitored. All feedback would, therefore, be welcome.

## Table 1: Further detail on key themes

Table 1 provides further detail in relation to the topics discussed in the key themes section. A more detailed breakdown of comments and actions will be provided at a later date to address comments and changes on an issue by issue level.

| Theme | Further detail |
|---|---|
| **Rigour routes** | Every effort has been made to ensure that where appropriate, credits work on a sliding scale. This enables HQM to encourage best practice while still appropriately recognising where efforts have been made to go beyond minimum standards. This was identified as an effective way of introducing flexibility and for HQM to recognise different approaches.<br><br>It is possible to adopt *different* routes of rigour within different issues throughout an assessment. For example a project might follow the comprehensive route within the Energy Forecast and Cost issue but decide to adopt the foundation route within the Ecology issue. |
| **Star rating** | A five star rating was adopted for HQM to make it more recognisable in line with other services and goods, like hotels and restaurants. This is in contrast to the CSH, which was set up by government in 2007 with the intention to use the maximum code level 6 as an aspirational target for what a sustainable home would look like in 2016. The top rating in HQM (five stars) is intended to be achievable, while driving innovation and best practice of housing standards forward. It is therefore more akin to the BREEAM rating system, where an 'Outstanding' score represents a highly sustainable building, which scored well against all aspects of the scheme.<br><br>The number of credits required to achieve a certain star rating is outlined in the beta version of the technical guide. As with the technical content this will continue to be monitored throughout the beta phase, to ensure the rating system reflects a balanced combination of: being achievable, recognising best practice and raising standards.<br><br>A distinctive feature of HQM is the introduction of indicators: 'My cost', 'My wellbeing', and 'My footprint' (i.e. the three pillars of sustainability from the occupant's perspective). The score achieved for each indicator will depend on the number of credits achieved within certain issues. For example, achieving credits in issues that are recognised as improving wellbeing (e.g. daylight, noise, air quality etc.), will contribute to achieving a high wellbeing indicator. An example of what this might look like is given on the HQM website, here. Indicators can be used to independently back up particular claims about a home, which can then be used for marketing purposes. The scheme design will also allow more indicators to be introduced over time. |
| **Post-certification commitments** | Awarding credits for commitments to carry out certain actions after certification, clearly comes with significant challenges. Various safeguards have therefore been introduced to ensure these commitments are carried out:<br><br>• Developers will have to provide clear evidence detailing what will be carried out, how occupants will access support, who will be responsible for carrying the commitments out and by when |

| Theme | Further detail |
|---|---|
| | - Home information will include confirmation of commitments and a copy of the HQM scorecard, which will clearly show where occupants have access to additional support.<br>- Additional credits will be available in the POE issue where there is a contractual arrangement in place for an independent third party to carry out a POE, in addition to the developer's commitment<br>- Similarly credits are available in the quality improvement issue for demonstrating that POEs have been carried out on previous comparable projects and the lessons learnt in the design and construction of that under assessment (previously communication/awareness and training issues – see table 2)<br>- Any commitments may be subject to checks by BRE Global. In case of any non-compliance BRE Global have the right to review or withdraw certification.<br>- There are a number of good examples of developers at all levels and scales providing aftercare support and POEs, which have been used to refine the requirements in HQM.<br><br>Overall, research and feedback from industry suggests that ensuring homes are managed and maintained well in practice is an essential part of reducing the performance gap. There are also benefits to developers such as increased customer satisfaction and valuable data, which can be used for marketing, business planning purposes and valuable lessons for future projects. As part of this we are also in the process of exploring ways to engage with occupiers directly to raise awareness and gain feedback. |
| **Building Regulations and planning requirements** | Some of the queries received indicate that there is some uncertainty around why HQM is a voluntary standard rather than a requirement enforced through planning (as with the Code). Please see our frequently asked questions relating to the Housing Standards Review for a detailed summary, which should answer any questions on this: https://www.bre.co.uk/housing-standards-review<br><br>We acknowledge that certain technical issues are partly covered by building regulations and / or planning requirements. Where this is the case, HQM uses these standards as a minimum requirement, rather than as best practice and encourages meaningful performance above the mandatory requirements. The purpose of HQM is to provide housebuilders with an independent tool to recognise quality homes developed above and beyond minimum standards.<br><br>There are also optional building regulations relating to water efficiency, space and security, which have been integrated into HQM. These optional standards only represent a small proportion of HQM's scope. We have removed and excluded any technical issues that are: already adequately covered by building regulations, beyond the scope of HQM, less of a priority compared to other key issues or where there is a lack of evidence to justify their inclusion. Please see Table 2 for details of removed or merged issues. |
| **Depth and complexity** | The technical criteria or requirements have been refined and simplified as much as possible focusing on improved usability and added flexibility. The changes mean more building types can be reflected in HQM, which was one of the main concerns voiced. |

| Theme | Further detail |
|---|---|
| | For example, the Daylight issue now awards credits for "daylight in living spaces" on a sliding scale. The 2% average daylight factor requirement is now awarded maximum credits to recognise best practice but credits are also available where either 1.5% or 1.8% is achieved, to recognise performance beyond minimum standards. Other examples include POE and Aftercare, which have been restructured with added explanations about how to achieve credits. <br><br> ***Outcome focussed*** <br> Technical criteria have been made more flexible by focussing on the desired outcomes and now avoids prescribing specific routes wherever possible. Instead they recognise the availability of multiple approaches to address requirements. Some issues also acknowledge that there may be alternative solutions not listed which may be acceptable, such as the Commissioning and Performance, and Smart Homes issues. <br><br> ***Developer engagement*** <br> We are working with a wide range of industry stakeholders, including private and social housing providers, assessor companies and other experts to help ensure HQM meets industry requirements. This engagement has already fed into the beta version and will continue to do so for future updates. <br><br> ***Balanced scorecard approach*** <br> HQM takes a balanced scorecard approach, adopted from BREEAM's credit weightings, in order to recognise that circumstances may determine which credits are available. For example, while a rural development may find it difficult to meet criteria in the Accessible Public Transport issue, they are more likely to achieve criteria for access to recreational space. Similarly, homes with large windows may find it more difficult to achieve the maximum credits in the energy forecast and cost issue but will be better placed to score well in the daylight issue. Not all credits are therefore going to be achievable by all homes, but there are enough applicable credits available throughout the scheme to ensure it is possible for different types of homes to still achieve the highest ratings. |
| **Tools** | Tools and supporting guidance will be released for the following issues: <br><br> Energy Forecast and Cost <br> Temperature <br> Accessible Transport <br> Water Efficiency <br> Environmental Impact of Products <br> Responsible Sourcing of Construction Products |

## Table 2: Removed and merged technical issues

List of issues removed, merged or fundamentally changed, as part of streamlining HQM's structure and adding value to priority areas (discussed above).

| Issue | Actions | Justification | New issue name |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Land use and visual impact** | Removed | This issue has been removed due to the concerns raised that it may be difficult to assess consistently. Local Authorities also cover this issue to a certain degree.<br>The principles behind this issue will continue to be under review for future versions of HQM. | N/A |
| **External spatial design** | Removed | Due to the subjective nature of this issue and subsequent difficulties in assessing and evidencing it, this issue has been removed. | N/A |
| **Ecology review**<br><br>**Maintaining ecological value**<br><br>**Ecological management** | Issues merged and streamlined | As a whole, the ecology issues were seen as an important area. The issues relating to ecology were merged to structure these issues more simply and succinctly. | Ecology review |
| **Growing space** | Criteria simplified and combined with the 'Recreational space' issue | Growing space proved to be an important and popular issue but subject to context and market needs.  It was decided to add this issue to the scope of the recreational space issue where the issue aims overlapped. The criteria have also been significantly simplified and credits adjusted. | Recreational space |
| **Leak detection** | Removed | While potentially an important issue the scale of systems makes this technically difficult to achieve effectively in smaller refrigerant systems.  This was removed as a result and the credits allocated were used to emphasise the importance of other issues. There is potential scope for leak detection systems to fit within the smart homes issue where relevant. | N/A |
| **Loss of daylight and sunlight to neighbouring properties** | Removed | Although this issue was based on best practice and is seen as valuable to an occupier, there were some concerns that this may unfairly penalise developments in areas where these factors fall beyond the project's control.  There was also concerns that such an issue could introduce an unfair risk of liability for those involved. This issue's focus is partly | N/A |

| Issue | Actions | Justification | New issue name |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | covered by the Right to Light Act. This issue has therefore been removed and emphasis given to other Health & Wellbeing issues. | |
| **Sunlight** | Removed | Issue removed as planning require sun light assessments where appropriate. | N/A |
| **External lighting** | Removed | Issue removed to streamline the scheme and allow added value in other priority areas. | N/A |
| **Communication** <br><br> **Awareness and training** | Merged | These issues have been merged due to their overlapping aims and to further streamline the scheme. <br><br> The content from the communication issue is now more outcome focused and less prescriptive, as part of addressing comments about making the scheme more flexible. <br><br> The focus on upskilling site operatives and professionals was supported in principle but asking for specific performance gap related training was not, as this is currently uncommon and would be difficult to assess. The issues have been amended and merged to recognise different ways of improving quality throughout the project from an early stage (see 'quality improvement' issue in beta version for details). | Quality improvement |
| **Diversion of waste from landfill** <br><br> **Waste arisings** | Issues merged and streamlined | These issues have been merged due to their overlapping aims and further streamline the scheme. | Site waste |
| **Monitoring and controls** | Fundamentally changed | Monitoring and controls criteria relating to low or zero carbon technologies and ventilation are now within their respective issues. Energy controls criteria now fall within a new issue based on smart and connected homes. <br><br> The principle of the monitoring and controls issue remains in place, which aims to promote systems that provide occupants with relevant, easy to understand information and simple controls for managing their comfort levels. The issue has been re-written to recognise the rapidly changing landscape for monitors and controls and for making homes intuitive. This area will continue to be closely monitored as HQM evolves to ensure that the scheme keeps up to date and promotes forward looking solutions. | Smart homes |

| Issue | Actions | Justification | New issue name |
|-------|---------|---------------|----------------|
|  |  | More flexibility has been added by recognising where capacity is given to homes that make it easy and cost effective for occupants to install devices/systems at a later date that meet their specific needs.<br><br>The core issue approach has also been simplified to address concerns outlined around the structure (discussed in summary of responses, above). |  |

## Table 3: Summary of issue name changes

In some instances, issue names have changed from those used in the consultation to reflect changes in technical content and to ensure they are consistent across the scheme.  Table 3 matches the issue names in the latest beta version of HQM to the ones in the technical consultation document.

| Consultation version issue name | Beta version issue name |
|---|---|
| Land Use and Visual Impact | N/A** |
| External Spatial Design | N/A** |
| Accessible Public Transport | Accessible Public Transport |
| Alternative Sustainable Transport options | Alternative Sustainable Transport Options |
| Local amenities | Local Amenities |
| Ecology Review | Ecology |
| Maintaining and enhancing ecological value | |
| Ecological management | |
| Site biodiversity | |
| Growing space | Recreational Space |
| Recreational space | |
| Flood Risk | Flood Risk |
| Managing the impact of rainfall | Managing the Impact of Rainfall |
| Security | Security |
| Energy Performance and Cost | Energy Forecast and Cost |
| Low and zero carbon technologies | Decentralised Energy |
| Impact on Local air quality | Impact on Local Air Quality |
| External lighting | N/A** |
| Indoor pollutants | Indoor pollutants |
| Daylight | Daylight |
| Loss of daylight and sunlight to neighbouring dwellings | N/A** |
| Sunlight | N/A** |
| Internal and external noise | Internal and External noise |
| Sound insulation | Sound Insulation |
| Temperature | Temperature |
| Ventilation | Ventilation |
| Environmental Impact of Materials | Environmental Impact of Construction Products |
| Life Cycle Costing of materials | Life Cycle Costing of Materials |
| Durability and Resilience | Durability of Construction Products |
| Responsible Sourcing | Responsible Sourcing of Construction Products |
| Drying space | Drying Space |
| Dwelling space | Access and Space |
| Recyclable Waste | Recyclable Waste |
| Water Efficiency | Water Efficiency |

| Consultation version issue name | Beta version issue name |
|---|---|
| Water Leak Detection | N/A** |
| Commissioning and Fabric Testing | Commissioning and Performance |
| Awareness and Training | Quality Improvement |
| Communication | |
| Construction Energy | Construction Energy Use |
| Construction Water | Construction Water Use |
| Waste Arisings | |
| Diversion from Landfill | Site Waste |
| Home information | Home Information |
| Monitoring and controls | Smart Homes |
| Post Occupancy Evaluation | Post Occupancy Evaluation |
| Aftercare | Aftercare |
| Considerate Construction | Considerate Construction |

**Issue no longer present

## 3. Next steps

This consultation has been an important milestone in the development of HQM, resulting in a number of positive changes. This report aims to provide a summary of the key messages received and how they have contributed to the beta version of HQM.

We are very excited that the beta version is now live but the development of HQM doesn't stop there. Operating a beta version for a short period will allow us to continue industry engagement and refine the scheme into HQM version 1 (anticipated in early 2017). As part of this we will continue to work with our study sites (see here for examples) to further improve the scheme and ensure it meets industry and consumer needs. As we progress through HQM's beta phase normal certification processes will apply and certificates will be available for all dwellings assessed under the beta version.

Thank you to all who have contributed to HQM so far. Please check the HQM website for any updates and contact the HQM team for any questions, further feedback or to express interest in being more involved with HQM: HQM@bre.co.uk

**The HQM team**